

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the telephonic interview on December 8, 2004. In the interview, the undersigned elected to prosecute the invention of claims 1-6.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC 102.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended. Claims 28-43 have been added. Claims 6-27 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-5 and 28-43 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

The undersigned affirms the election of claims 1-6.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Davis* et al (6,816,391).

In contrast to *Davis*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing, the rotation of the handle causing the removable access door to be mounted and released to and from the housing." In *Davis*, the squeeze handle 30 does not pivot, but rather slides. The access door is released by squeezing the release handle 30. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 2-5 and 28-34 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above, it should be noted that they provide additional language that is unsupported by the cited art. For example, in contrast to *Davis*, claim 32 specifically requires, "the retention hooks are positioned within the access opening, and wherein the hook receivers are positioned on an inner surface of the access door."

In contrast to *Davis*, new claim 35 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a quick release handle configured to facilitate the engagement and disengagement of the locking mechanisms via a pivoting action, the quick release handle pivoting between an open position

where the locking mechanism are forced into disengagement thereby releasing the access door from the housing, and a closed position where the locking mechanisms are forced into lockable engagement thereby securing the access door to the housing."

In contrast to *Davis*, new claim 40 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a handle that is pivotally coupled to the housing..."

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45, 738

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300